

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 20-25 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 12-19 have been canceled. Claims 20-25 are newly-added.

The Examiner has required a new title. Accordingly, the title has been amended to read:
RECORDING MEDIUM DRIVE HAVING RECTIFIER PLATE INTEGRAL TO RAMP MEMBER.

Before turning to the cited references, a brief review of the claimed invention is in order.

Claim 1, as amended, of the instant application recites a “rectifier plate” integrally formed on a ramp member. The ramp member is designed to receive the tip end of the head actuator. The term “ramp member” is a generic term for identifying a “ramp” designed to receive the tip end of the head actuator. It is fixed at a position outside the outer periphery of the recording medium, as defined in amended claims 1 and 4.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,526,206 to Shimizu (hereafter “**Shimizu**”).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Shimizu discloses a cam 20 formed on a cover plate 11 (see column 3, lines 13-14). Unlike the claimed invention, it is not fixed at a position outside the periphery of the recording medium. Moreover, **Shimizu** fails to disclose or suggest any such “rectifier” plate. There is no description of the surface of the cam 20 opposed to the disk 10, such as texture, roughness, distance from the disk, etc. As shown in FIG. 1 of **Shimizu**, one of ordinary skill in the art

would not recognize cam 20 of Shimizu as a rectifier plate.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,987,640 to Tsang et al. (hereafter, "Tsang et al.").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Like Shimizu discussed above, Tsang et al. also fails to disclose or suggest a rectifier plate "integrally" formed on the ramp member, as Tsang et al. discloses an "integral ramp 880" in column 9, lines 29-31. However, the second extensions 830, serving as rectifier plates, can be rotated with respect to the base 102 (see column 9, lines 43-44). This means that the second extensions 830 are not integrally formed on the ramp member 880, as required in claims 1 and 4 of the instant application. Shimizu cannot compensate this feature of "integrally formed," because the core feature of Tsang et al. resides in that second extensions are rotatable.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 6-11 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner has indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully defer this action until a FINAL Office Action, if any, is received.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-11 and 20-25, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks

William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak
Atty. Docket No. **031283**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Check in the amount of \$120.00